REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-14 and 32-44 are pending, of which claims 1-3, 5-8, and 32-44 have been amended. The claim amendments are supported by at least Applicant's Fig. 5 and the Specification at page 14, lines 8-16.

Applicant describes that a host computing device and a client device each include multipoint distributed network data communication components (*Specification* p.11, lines 21-22; Fig. 5). A Remote NDIS miniport driver layer of the host computing device is implemented in the client device (instead of in the host computing device) which facilitates a point-to-point communication link between the two devices without having to configure the host computing device with interface components to communicate with the client device. The host computing device can be communicatively linked with any mobile client device without having driver(s) for a particular device installed on the host computing device (*Specification* p.14, lines 8-16; Fig. 5).

35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections

Claims 1-14 and 32-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Applicant's specification background (hereinafter, "Background") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,233,619 to Narisi et al. (hereinafter, "Narisi") (*Office Action* p.2). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites a "data communication system configured to communicatively link a host device and a client device with a point-to-point data communication link, the host device and the client device each configured for multipoint data communication over a distributed network, the data communication system comprising a remote data communication interface driver of the host device implemented in the client device, the remote data communication interface driver configured to communicatively link with a data communication interface of the host device via the point-to-point data communication link"

Narisi and/or the Background do not teach or suggest "a remote data communication interface driver of the host device implemented in the client device", as recited in claim 1. Further, Narisi and/or the Background do not teach or suggest "the remote data communication interface driver configured to communicatively link with a data communication interface of the host device via the point-to-point data communication link", as recited in claim 1.

Applicant's Fig. 4 only shows a remote NDIS miniport driver layer (414) implemented in a computing device (402), but not a remote data communication interface driver of a host device implemented in a client device, as recited in claim 1. Similarly, Narisi does not describe any such configuration. Contrary to implementing a component of a host device in a client device, as recited in claim 1, the Office points out that the use of a virtual LAN in Narisi allows two devices to use their native mechanism to communicate with each other (*Office Action* p.3).

Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the Background-Narisi combination for at least the reasons described above, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2-14 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 1. Additionally, some or all of claims 2-14 may be allowable over the Background-Narisi combination for independent reasons.

Claim 32 recites a method for implementing a point-to-point data communication link between computing devices, the method comprising "implementing a remote network communication component of a host computing device in a client computing device, the remote network communication component designed for data communication over a distributed network", and "implementing a connection interface to couple the remote network communication component with the host computing device".

As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, Narisi and/or the Background do not teach or suggest "implementing a remote network communication component of a host computing device in a client computing device", as recited in claim 32. Narisi does not include any such communication configuration.

Accordingly, claim 32 is allowable over the Background-Narisi combination for at least the reasons described above, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 33-44 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 32. Additionally, some or all of claims 33-44 may be allowable over the Background-Narisi combination for independent reasons.

Conclusion

Pending claims 1-14 and 32-44 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that preclude issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: _Aug. 2, 2005_   By: _____

David A. Morasch
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Reg. No. 42,905
(509) 324-9256 x 210

lee hayes

13

MSI-921US M02